REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Jayaraman et al, US Patent No. 6,963,549 ('549 patent). This is the same rejection that was addressed by applicant in the previous Office Action response, and applicant again respectfully traverses.

Applicant argued the following points:

1. No spoofing whatsoever takes place. The effort by the central authority is to offer to a requesting station as much of the medium's time as it requests, given the constraints presented by the needs of other stations.

2. Claim 1 specified a step of setting a duration value to a value **other than** a time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission, and now specifies a step of setting a duration value to a value **greater than** a time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission.

The Examiner asserts that applicant's argument is not persuasive because "since station 20 can extend the reserved time period by responding to the refresh notice by the central authority 42, the duration valued can be a value that is greater than a time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission."

In rebuttal, applicant wishes to point out the following.

First, it is respectfully submitted that the issue is NOT what station 20 **can do**, but rather when station 20 **is described as, or taught as, doing**. What station 20 is described as doing is sending a request that reflects the information it wishes to send. *There is no teaching or a suggestion that station 20 ever spoofs*.

Second, the entire notion that another time slot may need to be allocated by the central authority for a given station suggests the contrary of spoofing through the means of requesting more time than is needed. It strongly implies that a request might be of time that is insufficient to send that which is needed to be transmitted.

Third, claim 20 specifies a step of sending a signal that contains a duration value, and an obeying station updates an NAV in accordance with the duration value. In the '549 patent stations update their NAV in response to a signal from the central authority. Hence, the step of sending that is recited by claim 1 must correspond, if at all, to the sending performed by the central authority. The central authority specifies a duration value that corresponds to what is requested. It has no volition whatsoever, and it

8

specifies a duration at a value that is what it expects to be the time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission. Again, there is no spoofing going on in anything that the central authority does.

Based on the above, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is NOT anticipated by the 549 reference.

Claims 3, 4, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 6,965,942 ('942 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses. Since the '942 patent does not teach spoofing, and is not even offered for such teaching, it does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above. Therefore, the combination of the '549 and the '942 patents does not result in the method defined by claims 3, 4, 8 and 9, nor does it result in a method that makes the method defined in claims 3, 4, 8, and 9 obvious.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of the '942 patent and further in view of US Patent 6,622,521 ('521 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses. The '521 patent does not teach spoofing, and the Examiner does not assert that it does. Rather, it is cited for the proposition that it teaches group addressing. Adding the '521 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, '942, and '521 patents does not render claims 5 and 10 obvious.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 5,557,745 ('745 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses. The '745 patent does not teach spoofing, and the Examiner does not assert that it does. Rather, it is cited for the proposition that it teaches group addressing or multicasting. Adding the '745 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, and '745 patents does not render claim 18 obvious.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 5,721,725 ('725 patent). The '725 patent does not teach spoofing, and the Examiner does not assert that it does. Rather, it is cited for the proposition that it teaches the problem of hidden stations not being aware of medium reservation. Adding the '725 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent,

demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, and '725 patents does not render claim 19 obvious.

Claims 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 6,920,171 ('171 patent). The '171 patent does not teach spoofing, and the Examiner does not assert that it does. Rather, it is cited for the proposition that it teaches the notion of lower priority devices deliberately limiting their transmissions, thereby increasing the likelihood of information from higher priority devices getting through. Adding the '171 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, and '171 patents does not render claims 10 and 22 obvious.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the '549 patent in view of US Patent 6,754,176 ('176 patent). The '176 patent does not teach spoofing, and it is not asserted that it does; but rather it is cited for the proposition that it teaches overlapping basic service sets. Adding the '176 patent does not remedy the failing of the '549 patent, demonstrated above, and consequently the combination of the '549, and '176 patents does not render claim 21 obvious.

Claims 6, 7, 11, and 13-17 were objected for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were deemed allowable otherwise. All of the objected claims are amended herein, as suggested by the Examiner to overcome the objection. Since the sole amendment to the claims conforms to the Examiner's suggestion and requires no additional search, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment should be entered in the record.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that all of the objections and rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,
Matthew J. Sherman

Dated: 12/27/06

By _____
Henry T. Brendzel
Reg. No. 26,844
Phone (973) 467-2025
Fax (973) 467-6589
email brendzel@comcast.net